

E 340
.B4 F15
Copy 1

THOMAS H. BENTON

One of Missouri's First Senators and a Great Statesman--Reminiscence by Judge

Thos. J. C. Fagg.

THOMAS H. BENTON.

Character sketches can accomplish little or no good except as they mark and illustrate the historical events of the period in which the subject lived.

I have selected the name of one of the first United States Senators of Missouri as the subject of this paper.

In making this choice I have not been prompted either by any personal predilections or partisan feeling. According to my understanding of his character he was a great man, and justice to his memory as well as a true history of the times in which he lived demand a true and impartial history of his life and public services.

I am not aware that the term "great man" has ever been defined. Emerson says: "I count that man great who inhabits a higher sphere of thought into which other men enter with labor and difficulty." I accept this definition and applying it to the subject of this sketch, I must say emphatically that Colonel Benton was a great man.

Of his early life it is sufficient to say that he was born in the state of South Carolina on the 14th day of March,

1782. That his father, a lawyer of some local prominence, died during the minority of the subject of this sketch, possessed of about forty thousand acres of land in the state of Tennessee, and that the widow in a short time afterwards removed to the latter state, taking her entire family with her.

Just when he studied law or commenced the practice of his profession I do not know. In 1846, after he had taken his "appeal to the people" from the instructions contained in what was known as the "Jackson Resolutions," he was in the town of Bowling Green, Pike County, for the purpose of making one of his characteristic speeches of that campaign. I was present as he entered the Court House and met an old gentleman who reminded him that he had met him in Tennessee and was a member of the jury in Benton's first case after he commenced practicing law. The suit involved the title to some personal property, the chief item being a lot of pumpkins. Benton said he remembered it well, shaking the old man's hand most cordially he said: "I was right then, wasn't I?" "Yes,"

the old line Whig said, "but I'll be d——if you have'nt been wrong ever since." With a look of intense disgust he turned upon his heel exclaiming in his own emphatic way, "the h——l you say!"

BENTON'S MILITARY RECORD.

Of his life in Tennessee very little seems to be known.

In the early part of the war of 1812 this was also true. It is said that for a time he acted as aid-de-camp to General Jackson and subsequently went to work to organize a regiment of volunteers for Jackson's army, but this was not completed before the battle of New Orleans, and his troops were disbanded. Soon after this he was made a lieutenant colonel in the regular service, but he only retained his office a short time. He resigned and then returned to the state of Tennessee.

In refering to his military record, I am reminded of what was said to me by a gentleman of intelligence and observation. This gentleman saw much of the enlisting and mustering in of the troops that were gathered in by General Jackson for the defense of New Orleans. He saw Benton in a colonel's uniform and mounted upon an elegant horse.

In describing his dress and general appearance he said to me, "he was the finest looking man on the continent."

Benton saw at once that at the conclusion of the war with England and the title of the French to the valleys of the two great rivers, the Missouri and the Mississippi, the most fertile and extensive country on the globe would be thrown open for settlement and cultivation. There was an anxi-

ous and enterprising populace extending from the Carolinas to New England watching eagerly for the moment to arrive when they could give up their homes in the east and find more fertile lands and larger possessions in the Great West.

Benton saw all this and judged correctly that St. Louis was to be the commercial center of this vast region, and he determined to give up his position in the army, abandon his home in Tennessee and locate permanently at this great central point.

He came to St. Louis ostensibly for the purpose of practicing law, but it is more than likely that he then had a thirst for political life and that he was prompted largely by the desire for political preferment and the honors of official position.

He must have come to St. Louis in the summer or fall of 1815. He there established a law office and became interested in a newspaper, the *Missouri Inquirer*, a journal that occasioned for him a number of duels. In one of which he killed his opponent, Lucas. He was a genuine American in sentiment and feeling and most profoundly impressed with the great importance of the future trade and commerce of the west and its ultimate influence and control in the policies of the Government. He was a strong supporter of western interest.

BENTON AND THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE.

Two of the great political questions that had been agitated from the beginning of the Government's existence were settled by the Congressional enactments of 1816. The surveys of the

public domain in the then Territory of Missouri had been so far completed that it was determined to put up these lands at public auction, as required by the laws of Congress.

Benton advocated the pre-emption of the public lands. He saw the intense interest manifested by the crowds in attendance upon that sale, and the speedy increase in the settlement and development of the territory, and he at once agitated the question of commencing the work of forming a state government. He was active in having the Territorial Legislature to take the first step in that direction by memorializing congress to pass an enabling act authorizing the holding of a convention to form a constitution upon which Missouri could ask for admission into the Union. The memorial was presented at the session of 1819-20, and the first great war of opinion on the subject of slavery was precipitated upon the country. It was so fierce and so bitter in its character as to threaten a dissolution of the Union as it then existed. Fortunately it resulted in what has been known ever since as "the Missouri Compromise."

Briefly, the terms upon which the people of the territory might apply for admission as a state, were, that it should come into the Union as a slave-state, but as to all of the remainder of the territory belonging to the United States "slavery or involuntary servitude should be forever prohibited north of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes of north latitude." Benton advocated the admission of Missouri as a slave state. Upon this compromise the people of the territory

elected delegates to a constitutional convention in the month of June following. The convention met in July 1820, and formed a constitution recognizing the existence of slaves as property, and containing a provision which required the Legislative Assembly, when assembled, to pass a law prohibiting free persons of color from entering into and becoming residents of the state. An election for state officers and members of the legislature was held in the month of August following. The legislature met in the month of November, 1820, and David Barton and Thomas H. Benton were elected to the United States Senate.

BENTON AND OTHER PUBLIC QUESTIONS

It has been commonly said that Col. Benton was opposed to slavery in the abstract. I have no sufficient evidence of that fact in his own declaration or in the political history of the country to prove it. In this connection it should be said to the credit of Col. Benton and for the purpose of fixing his status upon the slave question, that he was an active participant in the work of procuring the act of congress authorizing the voters of the Missouri Territory to form a constitution recognizing the existence of slavery, that the members of the constitutional convention from St. Louis county were unanimously in favor of making Missouri a slave-state. The provision prohibiting free persons of color from other states from entering or remaining in this state was his own work, written with his own hand.

This seems to me to be quite sufficient to disprove the above statement.

The members elected to the Legisla-

ture in August, 1820, at least a majority of them, were decidedly in favor of slavery, and they elected Benton to the Senate of the United States at a time when the existence of slavery was the all-absorbing and controlling question in every election. This it seems to me ought to settle the question beyond a reasonable doubt, that Benton was not at heart an anti-slavery man at that time.

No subsequent event in his political career since that time can be shown to prove that he had changed his position on that subject. And the statement I think stands unproved.

On March 4th, 1821, when Benton became a member of the United States Senate, three of the most important questions that had agitated the people and the halls of legislation in the country had been settled. These were (1) the charter of the United States Bank, (2) a protective tariff and (3) slavery.

The question of the power of Congress to charter such an institution as the bank had been bitterly contested by the strict constructionists of the constitution, from the beginning of its existence in 1791. It was always admitted that there was no direct or especial grant of power to Congress to charter such an institution, but that its existence depended entirely upon an implied power under the word *necessary*. The charter of 1791 expired in 1811. It was chartered in 1816 to run for another period of twenty years. It rested again entirely upon the implied power under the word *necessary* in the Constitution.

The financial condition of the coun-

try at the end of the war of 1812 being such as in the opinion of many of the strict constructionists to justify their votes in its favor. The bank, however, did not meet the expectation of its friends in the regulating and preserving the monetary affairs of the country so as to prevent the terrible state of things which existed in 1819-20 and for some time afterwards.

BENTON'S DEFENSE OF CLAY.

Missouri was finally admitted into the Union as a state a few hours before the commencement of James Monroe's second term, March 4th, 1821, as President. The eight years (from March 4th, 1817 to March 4th, 1825) in which he filled that office has generally been designated in the political history of the country as "an era of peace and good-will." The line of division between political parties at that time, so as to fix definitely the status of many of the prominent men in public life was not very clearly drawn.

The general division of parties up to that time had simply been between Federalists and Republicans. It seems a little strange to partisans of the present day to note the fact, that John Quincy Adams, the recognized leader of the Federal party of the North, should have been selected by President Monroe, an avowed states-rights Democrat of the South, as his chief cabinet officer—Secretary of State. This selection of Mr. Adams, however, is not so difficult to account for as the appointment of Henry Clay to the same office by Mr. Adams after he became President in 1825.

I mention this fact for the purpose

of calling attention to an act of Col. Benton for which he has scarcely received the credit to which he was entitled.

At the presidential election of 1824, it will be remembered there were four candidates—John Quincy Adams, William H. Crawford, the nominee of a congressional caucus, Gen. Andrew Jackson and Henry Clay. Neither one having received a majority at the polls the election was thrown into the House of Representatives and resulted in the choice of Mr. Adams. Henry Clay was then a member of the House, and, against the public expectation, cast his vote for Adams. The appointment of the distinguished Kentuckian to the office of Secretary of State gave rise to the suspicion and afterwards to the open charge of "bargain and corruption," which for a time greatly agitated the people of the whole country, to the great injury of both the President and his Secretary of State. Col. Benton very promptly exonerated Mr. Clay from the slander of his enemies by making the statement that he (Clay) had told him in a private conversation long before the election that he intend to vote for Adams. The circumstances were such as to place Mr. Clay in a very awkward position. His personal and political enemies were hard to convince of his innocence and it was a noble act and a very gracious thing for a political opponent to do. Col. Benton and Mr. Clay were connected by marriage, the former being a blood-relation of the latter's wife. It was said—but upon what authority I know not—that being of the same political creed up to the

election of 1824, Benton had favored the election of Mr. Clay to the Presidency. In Col. Benton's own language, they had been very intimate up to that time and it was during that intimacy and previous to the election by the House of Representatives that Mr. Clay had confidentially said to Benton that he intended to cast his vote for Mr. Adams. The testimony of Col. Benton was of double value by reason of the fact that his own party was exceedingly anxious to establish the truth of the statement made by Mr. George Kremer, a member of congress from Pennsylvania, that the appointment of Mr. Clay as Secretary of State was the result of a corrupt bargain between him and the President. A verbal report of the speech of John Randolph, of Virginia, made in the Senate of the United States during the discussion of the Panama Mission represented him as saying that a certain letter sent to the Senate by the President "bore the ear-mark" of having been manufactured or forged by the Secretary of State (Clay) and denounced the administration as "a corrupt coalition between the black-leg and the Puritan." Whether the report was true or false, it would have been accepted as a genuine utterance of that erratic statesman.

The result was that Clay challenged him to mortal combat and a dual actually took place between these distinguished men, during the first week in April, 1826, near the city of Washington. Col. Benton was the only disinterested witness, and, after the exchange of two harmless shots, he with some other members of the

party, secured a meeting of the two principals at which mutual explanations were made, the difficulty satisfactorily adjusted and friendly greetings exchanged. From this point Clay and Benton drifted farther and farther apart until a state of violent antagonism was reached. This continued for many years and up to a short time before Mr. Clay's death in 1852.

BENTON ON NULLIFICATION.

I pass on to the very celebrated debate in the Senate between Hayne of South Carolina and Daniel Webster upon the resolution of Senator Foote of Connecticut, in reference to the appointment of a committee to inquire into the expediency of discontinuing the survey and sale of the public lands and to abolish the office of Surveyor General. The debate took a wide range, taking in the relative powers of the State and Federal governments, in which the doctrine of nullification by a state against a law of Congress was first asserted as one of the remedies to which it might resort in its extremity. Col. Benton seems not to have taken this as at all serious; said, "he did not believe in anything praetial from nullification, did not believe that there would be forcible resistance to the laws of the United States from South Carolina, did not believe in any scheme for disunion." He said he "believed in the patriotism of Mr. Hayne and as he came into the argument on my side in the matter of the public lands so my wishes were with him and I helped him when I could. Of this desire to help and disbelief in unionism, I gave proof in ridicule-

ing as well as I could Mr. Webster's fine peroration to liberty and union and really thought it out of place, a fine piece of rhetoric misplaced for want of circumstances to justify it."

Posterity will hardly give Col. Benton credit for perfect candor in making this statement. It was always his boast that he was a Democrat of the Jeffersonian school. The fundamental creed of that school was a belief in the doctrine of "State's rights" as interpreted by him in the celebrated Resolutions of 1798. It was upon South Carolina's interpretation of these Resolutions that the doctrine of nullification was based. In every step taken by that state in its determination to resist the execution of the provisions of the tariff law of 1828, they were guided by the principles and policy contained in those Resolutions according to the interpretation of the Southern Democrats and the correctness of that interpretation can hardly be questioned today. When the point was reached at which Andrew Jackson felt called upon to issue his celebrated Proclamation to the people of that state, giving his interpretation of the Constitution and defining the relative power of the Federal and state governments, he enunciated principles and views entirely different from those embodied in these Resolutions. Benton endorsed this proclamation and really became Jackson's chief lieutenant and champion during the whole of the fierce war that was made against his administration by Mr. Calhoun and his followers.

I am aware that Col. Benton claimed at the time that they had given a

new interpretation to these Resolutions, but he did not point out in what essential particular it differed from the true interpretation, and the fact would seem to be that that interpretation continued to be maintained by the Southern Democracy down to 1861. The truth must be admitted that the principles enunciated by Gen. Jackson became the creed of a new type of that party which continued to control the affairs of the Government down to the end of Van Buren's term in 1841. Calhoun and his followers deserted the Democratic party, formed an alliance with Henry Clay and the Whig party and through the last term of Jackson and the four years of Van Buren assisted in overthrowing the Jacksonian Democracy. There never was a more exciting and enthusiastic political canvas than that of 1840, when Wm. Henry Harrison, the candidate of the Whig party, defeated Mr. Van Buren—the pet of Gen. Jackson—for the Presidency.

There was a singular combination of political elements that secured the final overthrow and defeat of the Jackson Democracy. Col. Benton did not go down at that time with the wing of the party to which he really belonged. Nominally he was classed with the organization as it was then constituted.

BENTON AND THE BANK AGITATION.

He was re-elected to the Senate in 1844 for another term of six years, but the "hand-writing on the wall" was already beginning to appear. Those who then began to take charge of the party machinery had no use for Benton, nor any other Jackson Democrat.

Nobody doubted the fact that Benton had been truly loyal to the party and Jackson's chief lieutenant from the day of his first inauguration down to the end of his successor's term of office, (1828-1840.)

In his first annual message to Congress in 1829 President Jackson declared his hostility to the re-chartering of the Bank of the United States. The charter granted in 1816 did not expire until 1836. Jackson anticipated that the friends of the Bank would not wait until near the end of the limited time of its existence before an application would be made for its renewal. He knew that the Bank was powerful and would use every means that it could control to perpetuate its existence. The voters of the country had to be aroused and prepared for the contest when it should come. From the moment that his hostility to the Bank was made known until the last day of its existence Benton was recognized as the leader of the anti-Bank forces in Congress, and the chief spokesman of the President. He bore the brunt of the fierce attacks made by such men as Clay, Webster, and a host of other distinguished advocates of the Bank and he continued the fight without loss of courage until the bill was passed in June, 1832. Gen. Jackson was supposed to be in great peril. He was a candidate for re-election in November following. Neither he nor his lieutenant were intimidated by the situation. The bill was promptly vetoed. The great battle in the halls of congress to pass it over the veto was fought to a final defeat and Jackson was triumphantly elected in the month

of November following.

I pass over the period which followed and begin with the effort to re-charter the Bank during the administration of John Tyler. Elected as vice-President on the ticket with Gen. Harrison, he proved to be a great disappointment to the party. A brief reference to the condition of affairs and the organization of parties after the death of nullification is necessary in order to explain what followed so far as Col. Benton's subsequent career was concerned.

BENTON ON PARTY CONTROL.

John C. Calhoun and his adherents, among whom was Mr. Tyler, openly allied themselves with Henry Clay and the Whig party. These men never intended this alliance to be anything more than a temporary one to defeat Gen. Jackson and ultimately to destroy his successor, Martin Van Buren. To accomplish that it had to be maintained until an opportunity should occur to put the Southern Democracy in control of the government. That meant the ultimate destruction of Col. Benton, Silas Wright of New York, and all men of that class. This purpose was greatly aided by the agitation of the slavery question by the North, which was commenced before the end of Jackson's second term. Congress was flooded with petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. This greatly irritated the South and ultimately led to the formation of a design on the part of the southern politicians to extend the area of slavery ostensibly for the purpose of preserving the balance of

power between the free and the slave states. They honestly believed that the movement meant an ultimate attack against the institution of slavery in the states and its ultimate destruction on the continent.

The States-rights element in the Whig party secured the nomination of Mr. Tyler. The old Bank failed in its application for renewal of its charter and its final death occurred in 1836, upon the expiration of the charter of 1816. The Jackson Democracy of course was jubilant, and Benton imagined that it had a permanent lease of power. After the death of the Bank there was a money crisis and a condition of affairs in the business world that baffles all description.

This condition lasted until after the election of 1840 and was the cause of the overwhelming defeat of the Democratic party. A Whig President and vice-president, were chosen with a decided Whig majority in both houses of congress. An extra session was speedily called and a bank bill satisfactory to the majority was speedily passed and the country was hopeful of a speedy return to an era of prosperity and happiness.

To the utter amazement of the Whigs, both in congress and the country, the bill was vetoed and the betrayal of the Whig party was complete.

A new cabinet with John C. Calhoun as secretary of state demonstrated to the country that a new power was in control of the country. The truth is that the Whig party was dead never to be resurrected, and the Jacksonian Democracy had been misplaced and superseded by an element

that would thereafter rule the country. In order to secure this position the old lieutenants and henchmen of Andrew Jackson were sent to the rear and a new arrangement made of all the party forces.

The party caucus and convention was declared to be the supreme power in all directions. Benton fought against this with all his might, but to no purpose. He denounced it as "a tyranny that completely destroyed the right of private judgment and left the individual member of the party at the mercy of men, tricksters and managers of the machine." As a necessary means to secure the vote of a united party, a candidate was nominated and elected to the Presidency in 1844, who was acceptable to Gen. Jackson. Mr. Van Buren with a majority of votes in the convention was unceremoniously set aside and James K. Polk of Tennessee put in his place. In the election of 1844 the chief issue was the annexation of Texas. Mr. Clay, the Whig candidate, had declared himself as opposed to it, while Mr. Polk and the entire Democratic party, with some few exceptions in the North and East, were enthusiastic in its favor. Clay was misunderstood and defeated, while the Democratic party with the connivance of President Tyler and his cabinet hastily consummated the act of annexation in the very last hours of Tyler's administration. The result of that annexation, as everybody knows, was the war with Mexico in 1846.

BENTON AND THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS.

By the course of events in the an-

nexion of Texas, Col. Benton was placed in a false position and from which he was never able to extricate himself. He believed that that territory ought as a matter of right to belong to the United States. His firm conviction at all times was that it had been unnecessarily relinquished to Spain by the treaty made with that country in 1819. It was afterwards secured by Mexico by its revolt from Spain and the United States had lost its title to it and could only recover it by legitimate, peaceful means.

At the time of the passage of the act annexing that territory, there was an actual war pending between Mexico and inhabitants of the territory who were in rebellion against the authority of Mexico. Of course the act of annexation amounted to an assumption of the war by our own government and a pledge to prosecute it for the benefit of the rebels. Benton believed that it would have been an easy matter to have secured it by treaty and purchase and that it would have been cheaper and better in all respects to have pursued such a policy. He was unquestionably right, and posterity will so decide.

It will serve no good purpose now to discuss the question as to who was responsible for the war with Mexico. My only object now is to place Col. Benton in a proper position and to relieve him from the charge of being false to the wishes and best interests of his constituents and of the South generally. He never objected to the making of that country slave territory if they so desired. The entire country was south of $36^{\circ}-30'$, and if

it had been a part of the territory of the United States at the time of the admission of Missouri it would have been covered by the Missouri Compromise and would have been properly slave territory, if the people of that territory so desired. He was simply opposed to the acquisition of any territory for the avowed purpose of the existence of slavery.

BENTON'S SLAVERY ATTITUDE.

It is proper here to state what I believe to have been the true position of Col. Benton on the question of slavery. From the time he entered the senate as the representative of Missouri, he recognized the fact that he was there simply by virtue of the provisions of the act by which his state became a member of the Union and that this law of congress was intended to be a full and complete settlement of the question of slavery as to all territory then held by the government, or, this act of congress he considered to be as sacred and as binding as the Constitution itself and to be faithfully kept and observed for all time.

He believed that the ordinance of 1787 was intended to be a final settlement of the question, and the only reason why Missouri should have been exempt from its provisions was that slaves were actually held in Missouri and was authorized and permitted to exist by the choice of the people themselves at the time of asking admission into the Union. This position may not have been correct yet it was really his political creed and all of his official acts in regard to the institution of slavery were controlled by this opinion.

He was identified with the slave-party when Missouri asked admission into the Union and his position was always that the people of the sovereign state, or those asking admission as a people who owned slave property, had a right to decide that question for themselves. He always opposed any action of the government that looked like an interference with that institution as it actually existed in the states. He held these views to the end of his career.

In all the violent opposition and abuse that he encountered during the years '49 and '50, he simply appealed to his record in the senate, just as if that was "known and read of all men." Every effort that was made to interrogate him upon the stump he regarded as a personal insult. "Why should a respectable woman of known reputation and character be insulted with an inquiry as to the rectitude of her conduct and the purity of her life?" Such a question, he argued, would not be permitted or tolerated in any community. And so with his position in regard to slavery in the states and in the territories as well.

During his whole public career he had opposed the organization of any party upon one idea. Parties were the natural and legitimate products of the different theories and policies of government, according to the different interpretations of the Federal Constitution. He always opposed the agitation of the slavery question, because it was sectional in its character, disturbing the peace of the country, and injuriously affecting the interests of the people who alone had the right

to decide as their judgment and consciences directed them. But all of this was of no avail. Men's prejudices were excited, their passions inflamed and a spirit of hate and intolerance dominated the masses of the people and the fate of the old senator was sealed by the result of the election of 1850.

BENTON AND THE BRITISH BOUNDARY.

In all the troubles and disappointments connected with the last years of his senatorial career he had at least one great triumph to boast of. That was in the settlement of the question of boundary between the United States and the British possessions. When the question of terminating the joint occupation by England and the United States of the territory of Oregon and fixing definitely the boundary line that separated Canada from our own domain was finally presented to Congress, an erroneous impression prevailed in that body, as well as among the masses of the people, in regard to it. A majority of the lower House of Congress and many men outside of that body, including the distinguished senator from Kentucky, Henry Clay, went to the extreme of claiming the entire territory up to 54°—40'.

The motto of this party being "fifty-four—forty, or fight." That was almost the universal cry both in congress and among the masses, until the country had almost reached the point of an open rupture with England. The bill finally reached the Senate where it was discussed with great warmth and ability. Benton waited until the extremists had exhausted the

subject on their side of it.

When it was announced that Benton would speak and that his views would be against the popular opinion upon the subject, the senate chamber was packed to the utmost of its capacity. The House adjourned and almost the entire body crowded into the senate chamber to swell the immense audience. The speech was the supreme effort of his life. It amounted to an absolute demonstration of the fact that the United States did not have title to an inch of land, north of the 49th parallel of latitude. When Benton's speech was concluded the question was settled, and the settlement was for all time to come.

Judge W. V. N. Bay, of Missouri, who was present on the occasion gave me an interesting account of the whole scene. As quick as he could get through the crowd he started down Pennsylvania Avenue for the purpose of overtaking Col. Benton, who, he learned had gone out ahead of him. He soon saw the stalwart form of the old Senator making his way to his home, "solitary and alone" according to his favorite expression—the crowd giving way as he approached. Hurrying on he soon overtook him. Taking him by the arm and greeting him most cordially, Benton turned towards him and grasping his hand said to him, "You ought to have been in the senate chamber this afternoon and heard my great speech on the Oregon bill." He replied, "I was there, Colonel, and heard every word of it." With a triumphant look and a tone of exultation he exclaimed: "Didn't I give Clay hell?"

THE END OF BENTON.

But enough. He was defeated in the contest for re-election to the senate. Unwilling to retire to private life, he became a candidate in St. Louis for a seat in the lower house of congress, and was elected. His career in that body added nothing to his fame, and he came back to Missouri determined to make another appeal to the people of the state for an endorsement of his political opinions and his distinguished services in the senate for a period of time, which he delighted to call his "Six Roman Lustrums."

But his race was run. He realized now that his career was ended. He spent the short remnant of his life in preparing for publication his famous and valuable political history,

which he was pleased to call "Benton's Thirty Years View."

Benton's was a noble personage. His was a stalwart frame, above the ordinary height and with a physical constitution well preserved by a life of prudent, temperate habits, he had the proud dignified appearance of the Roman Senator. This was the model which during his entire public life he kept steadily in view and sought to emulate. He died in Washington City on the 10th of April, 1858, being a little more than seventy-six years of age. He might have left as his epitaph, the well known words of Horace; "*Eregi monumentum aere perennius.*" (I have erected a monument more enduring than brass.)

THOS. J. C. FAGG.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 782 542 5